workmen to do the repairs. From this person (Mrs. Butler) the plaintiff, on the 17th of March, obtained the key of the house, took possession, and set the workmen to do the repairs. Having, therefore, taken possession of the premises before the tenancy had expired, the plaintiff had put an end to the tenancy, and could not recover the rent.

The learned Judge interposed. He was clearly of opinion, he said, that the defendant was to some extent liable for dilapidations, but as he felt some difficulty in estimating the damages, his Honour suggested that the better course would be for the parties to retire, and endeavour to effect an amicable arrangement.

Mr. Wakeling, after conferring with the defendant, made an offer of 5*l*. These terms, were, however, rejected, and witnesses were called who lodged in the house, and whose evidence went to show that it was not untenantable when they left, which was shortly before quarter-day.

Mrs. Butler, the person with whom the key was left, stated that she gave the key to the plaintiff by his own request, and without the knowledge of the defendant. It was returned to her at night, and given to the workmen every morning whilst the house was undergoing repair.

Mr. Austin, the plaintiff's solicitor, submitted that his client had not held *bonâ-fide* possession, the key having been returned to the last witness every night.

The Judge—That is very satisfactorily explained; it was for your client's convenience. I am of opinion that you have not proved the rent to be due, having taken possession before the tenancy had expired. With regard to the damages for repairs, I do not know how to assess them. I think there are some things which the defendant is liable to make good; but the workmen you employed have made out their bills in the aggregate, so that it is impossible for me to estimate the damages. It was for you to have made out your case, but you having failed in establishing to what extent the defendant is liable, the consequence must be a nonsuit in both cases.

FIGURES.

Sir,—The fact mentioned in your last number—"That upon deducting 1 from the multiplier and adding 1 to the multiplied of any two even numbers, the result is less by 1:"—thus:—

8 × 8 64
7 × 9 63
—
1

is only part of a rule that upon deducting *any number* from the multiplier and adding it to the multiplied (in even numbers) the decrease is always *the square of the number* so deducted and added. Thus:—

8 × 8 64
7 × 9 63
—
1 square of 1.

Deduct and add 2—
8 × 8 64
6 × 10 60
—
4 square of 2.

Deduct and add 3—
8 × 8 64
5 × 11 55
—
9 square of 3.

and so on.—I am, Sir, &c., F. L. S.
Holgate-lodge.

An Architect's Jaw.—Amongst a number of very odd things, the property of the late reverend Ordinary of Newgate, Mr. Cotton, sold a few days ago, was the asserted "lower jaw of Peter of Cole-Church, the original architect of London-bridge." This bone was found on removing the foundation of part of the old bridge by a Mr. Knight, who superintended the building of the new bridge under Rennie, and the relic was christened by him without any godfather to answer for the child. The real value of the thing seems to have been well understood, for the public would not "take his jaw," and poor Peter fetched but five shillings!

ANOTHER "ORIGINATER OF THE RAILWAY SYSTEM."

A new candidate for the honour of being "the actual originater of the railway system,"—due, as we have said, to no one individual,—must now be added to the rather numerous list already on recent record. And if all be true that is alleged, the only wonder is that the name of this new claimant has not been all along interwoven with that of "*his partner in the locomotive patent*," Mr. Geo. Stephenson, the more especially since the former is said to have expended a fortune of his own in laying the foundations of that fortune which the latter realised.

Almost every great invention or discovery, at one particular period in its progress towards public approval and adoption, has to run the gauntlet of that very public's ignorant scorn, and certainly the man who has braved, stirred up, and borne the brunt of that most pitiful and contemptible of all earthly things—the sneers of ignorance and prejudice, in a manly resolve to benefit the scorning public itself, deserves to be held in the most sacred remembrance by all on whom his *indispensable* services have conferred the benefit of thus preparing the way for the smoother and then only practicable progress of those whose destiny it is to consummate what it seldom or never falls to the lot of one to mature as well as to begin.

The lot of Mr. Stephenson fell mainly on the smooth and levelled path whence the pioneers had manfully swept away all the native rugged obstructions which the public mind, in the sarcastic pride of its aboriginal ignorance, inevitably bristles up into the very way which it is itself most thankful to follow whenever its own thorny and inveterately defended obstructions are mowed down, in spite of its own determined opposition. But Mr. William James, of London, engineer, is now declared by "a coal and iron master in Staffordshire," in the *Birmingham Journal*, to have been the man who mainly smoothed the path which his partner, Mr. Stephenson, afterwards trod.

In allusion to a memoir of Mr. Stephenson, quoted from the *Derby Reporter*, this defender of the claim of Mr. James says:—

"It does not state that he was co-partner with Mr. William James, of London, land agent and engineer, in the locomotive patent, or that the latter was the actual originater of the railway system forty years since, by his proposing a line from these towns to Birmingham, through the colliery districts, and a communication from thence by canal to Stafford, and by the river Avon to Bristol, and subsequently *his* more grand project, the Manchester and Liverpool line, for engine-passenger traffic. The biographical notice gives to Mr. Stephenson the undivided honour, by calling him the "father of railways," when it should have referred principally to the improved locomotive engine. The railway machinery has been brought to its present perfection by the combined engineering talent of the nation. William James was really the leader, and the only successful agitator of the subject—the first person who gave the impulse to the ponderous mass of inertia in the public mind, by which vigorous effort the mighty movement commenced, and has been since kept up by Mr. G. Stephenson and his talented son, and other eminent engineers of the age. No one could have succeeded in that undertaking but such a man as William James, who all his life had been accustomed to struggle with and execute difficult projects, who possessed a wide connection with the nobility and great landed proprietors, with whom he was accustomed to mix, and to negotiate matters of business. Being a man of good education, tact, and business habits, he was in all respects the very best captain to attack the strongholds of ancestral prejudice, followed up and supported by Stephenson's practical ability. If two such minds had not been brought happily into apposition, the railway system might have been successfully opposed—the engineering talents of a Stephenson might not have been known, and all the iron sleepers might have slept on still in mother earth, and its great benefits have been denied to the present generation. To William James alone belongs the merit of being its earliest agitater *in all parts* of the kingdom—in making the survey of the first line, and organising the first company, and lodging the first report and plans of the Manchester and Liverpool Railway. The contrast is remarkable in the success in life of the two parties, and there appears to be some mistake and confounding of the labours and position of each. William James was the party who 'underwent something akin to persecution;' he had to bear the first shock of the contest, and this persecution seems to have descended on his family. The sons of genius do not often combine within themselves the faculty of self-interest—the especial glory and climax to be aimed at in vulgar eyes; and thus, for being rich and becoming poor for the public benefit, he has been reviled and pointed at with the finger of scorn *during* his agitation of this project."*

A SITE FOR THE MARBLE ARCH.

Sir,—The addition to the Royal palace now approaching completion, makes it evident that the marble arch should soon be removed, but I have not seen it stated yet where is the destined locality. I suggest that it be placed as an entrance to Kensington Gardens, in the Kensington-road, where the broad walk terminates. As this magnificent walk ends abruptly against the wall, it is in itself incomplete for a purpose. If the arch were placed in a slightly recessed curve from the main road, it would have a beautiful effect, and the superb vista beyond would render the *ensemble* perfect. Besides, at present there is no grand or state entrance to the gardens, nor could any be found so appropriate as this.

If the ugly rear of the pitiful horse-barrack were removed by demolition of the building, and the dwarf wall and railing of the garden made continuous, this entrance to the metropolis would receive a great accession of beauty: ample space for its re-erection would be formed on the green on the western side of the palace buildings, which already has a similar building. The offensive toll-bar would then be removed as a matter of course. —I am, Sir, &c.

An Idler in London.

ALL-ABSORBING CONTRACTORS.

Sir,—About three years ago you were pleased to insert a letter of mine on the subject of the great firms taking contracts for every tradesman's work in building.

What I wish to renew is the good old plan of every material trade contracting for its own work.

Would such fortunes have been made if that had been the case with certain large works; or rather, would not many little fortunes have been made by very deserving tradesmen, competent to the best work, and contented with a little? Society gains nothing by the new plan, and the work is not so well done or so well looked after, and I may say hardly at all by the master.

A broken-down carpenter, a little tyrannical, becomes foreman, and a man of figures a clerk; and then add a questionable plumber, an indifferent smith, and a sort of ironmonger's all-sorts shop; and you make a great builder's establishment. Large contracts bring large sums of money, and squeezing does the rest.

Pray let this question be brought to a fair issue.† The division may be a little more trouble to the architects, but they will get what they are always crying out about, *good work*, by it.—I am, Sir, &c. L. T.

* "William James," he adds, "before he commenced his speculative career, was Lord of Snowford Manor. He raised 100 men as volunteers in Warwick at the time of the threatened invasion, and was elected major, and presented with a sword worth sixty guineas on their being disbanded; and it was shown that his property exceeded 100,000*l.* in value. The last reserve of this fortune was expended in this project of the railway system. He lived through the pelting of the wintry storm, but his more fortunate coadjutor, without education or address to propose a public measure, rose from poverty to wealth in the summer glory of the scheme, and died proprietor of Tapton House. He deserved all the honours that have been heaped upon him; but does not Mr. James's successful efforts and personal services in this, and many other great undertakings, deserve commemoration and regard? I was at Liverpool for my health at the period of the first survey, and had opportunities of seeing the parties almost daily."

† With which view, rather than from entire concurrence in the writer's views, we insert this letter.—Ed.